



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,436	10/17/2002	Frederick L. Travelute III	3000.166	8668

21176 7590 03/18/2005

SUMMA & ALLAN, P.A.
11610 NORTH COMMUNITY HOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
CHARLOTTE, NC 28277

EXAMINER	
BOYD, JENNIFER A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1771	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

LD

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/065,436

Applicant(s)

TRAVELUTE ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer A Boyd

Art Unit

1771

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

11. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument that the inclusion of the pore forming agent of Shiozaki materially affects the basic and novel characteristics of the filament, the Examiner submits that there is no evidence of record to substantiate Applicant's allegation. Additionally, the Applicant contends that the basic and novel characteristics of the invention is not simply "the ability to fill with a liquid", however, the Applicant fails to clearly state what are all the basic and novel characteristics of the invention. Furthermore, the Applicant must evidence that such addition of the pore forming agent impacts the basic and novel characteristics of the invention. As noted, such evidence is lacking; see MPEP 2112. In response to Applicant's argument that JP 57139600 A is silent with respect to openings in the filament that can be "substantially filled" or "filled entirely" with water or other liquids the Examiner respectfully submits that the required physical structure is present in JP 57139600 A. Although the "empty core fibers" are used to create a flexible and bulky material in the prior art, the prior art meets the structural and/or chemical limitations set forth and there is nothing on record to evidence that the prior art product could not function in the desired capacity. The burden is shifted upon the Applicant to evidence the contrary. In response to Applicant's argument that the thermal bonding of the hollow fibers of Tamiya (JP H3-287848) and Jennergren (US 6,368,990) would destroy the absorptive capability of the instant invention by obliterating the sufficient openings that allow the substantial filling with water, the Examiner respectfully points out that no such requirement is made by the claims. The claims only require that the fibers themselves are capable of filling with water or liquid but does not require that the filling capability is still present once assembled into a nonwoven fabric. Furthermore, the Applicant has not submitted any evidence of record to support Applicant's allegation that the use of a sheath-core fiber would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the fiber. In summary, the Examiner requests that the Applicant clearly state what are the basic and novel characteristics of the invention and provide evidence to support Applicant's arguments. Alternatively, the Applicant may wish to use "consisting of" language which would exclude any element, step, or ingredient not specified in the claim. The rejections are maintained

Jeff Boyd
3/12/05



TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700